

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's analysis of the claims and prior art, and his allowance of the claims. The applicants re-iterate their comments on statement for reasons of allowance submitted November 19, 2003.

In summary, the action says that claims 1 and 13 define a coupler circuit comprising "at least one first and second sampling elements coupled to an output of the output matching network for sampling the first and second portion of the signals . . ." This is not accurate for the first sampling element. Instead, as defined by claim 1, the at least one first sampling element is coupled to an output of the output power source. In a similar manner, because claim 13 depends from claim 1, it also has the same limitation. Moreover, the action continues by saying that the limitations (of claims 1 and 13) give more accurate power measurement only if the load impedance is the same as the sample impedance. If the "sample impedance" is that of the output matching network, then that statement (in the action) is inaccurate. To the contrary, changes in load impedance should not produce errors in power measurement. Specifically, the load impedance can be determined based upon a number of known properties of the output matching network (e.g., output voltage and phase, input voltage and phase, input and output impedance). In a similar manner, if the "sample impedance" is that of the detector used to determine the input and output voltages (e.g., the processor in claim 1), then that statement in the action still is inaccurate. This impedance should be high enough by design to have minimum impact on the system for reasonable conditions of the load impedance. In cases where this is not true, it still is a known entity and the effect from this parasitic can be mathematically removed from the calculations.

Consequently, the power measurement should be unaffected if load impedance varies.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven G. Saunders
Registration No. 36,265

02550/00113 428387.1.